

## **CHAPTER 2**

---

### **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Introduction  
General Information  
Potentially Significant Impact Areas  
Determination  
Environmental Checklist and Discussion  
    Aesthetics  
    Agriculture Resources  
    Air Quality  
    Biological Resources  
    Cultural Resources  
    Energy  
    Geology and Soils  
    Hazards and Hazardous Materials  
    Hydrology and Water Quality  
    Land Use and Planning  
    Mineral Resources  
    Noise  
    Population and Housing  
    Public Services  
    Recreation  
    Solid/Hazardous Waste  
    Transportation/Traffic  
    Mandatory Findings of Significance  
    Conclusion  
References  
Acronyms  
Glossary



**INTRODUCTION**

The environmental checklist provides a standard evaluation tool to identify a project's adverse environmental impacts. This checklist identifies and evaluates potential adverse environmental impacts that may be created by the proposed project.

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

Project Title:	Petro-Diamond Terminal Company Marine Terminal Permit Modification Project
Lead Agency Name:	South Coast Air Quality Management District
Lead Agency Address:	21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765
CEQA Contact Person and Phone Number:	Barbara Radlein (909) 396-2716
Project Sponsor's Name:	Petro-Diamond Terminal Company
Project Sponsor's Address:	1920 Lugger Way, Long Beach, CA 90813
Project Sponsor's Contact Person and Phone Number:	Mike Dougherty (949) 553-0112
Port Master Plan Designation:	Primary Port Facility
Description of Project:	PDTC operators are proposing modifications to its SCAQMD air permits in order to increase the allowable throughput of the terminal, change the maximum allowable daily throughput through the truck loading rack, and change the allowable number of marine vessels that can visit the facility.
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:	Port-related uses including marine terminals, storage facilities and distribution facilities.
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:	None

## **POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AREAS**

The following environmental impact areas have been assessed to determine their potential to be affected by the proposed project. As indicated by the checklist on the following pages, environmental topics marked with an "✓" may be adversely affected by the proposed project. An explanation relative to the determination of impacts can be found following the checklist for each area.

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics            | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources         | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources  | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources            | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils         | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/<br>Water Quality              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning     | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing    | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Solid/Hazardous Waste | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/<br>Traffic    | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory<br>Findings of<br>Significance |

## DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and that a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be significant effects in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Date: August 15, 2007

Signature: Steve Smith  
Steve Smith, Ph.D.  
Program Supervisor

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION**


---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>1. AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**1.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

The proposed project impacts on aesthetics will be considered significant if:

The project will block views from a scenic highway or corridor.

The project will adversely affect the visual continuity of the surrounding area.

The impacts on light and glare will be considered significant if the project adds lighting which would add glare to residential areas or sensitive receptors.

**1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS**

**1. a), b) and c)** The existing PDTC facility is located within the industrialized Port area adjacent to the Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A automobile receiving, preparation and storage facility. The proposed project will have no change in the visual appearance of the PDTC facility. No new facilities are required as part of the PDTC proposed project and no construction activities are proposed. There would be no changes from the current visual conditions and the facility would be consistent with the industrialized visual environment of the Port. The proposed project would not obstruct scenic views or vistas, nor create significant aesthetic impacts because the proposed project will not require any physical changes at the existing PDTC facility.

**1. d)** The PDTC facility is located within the industrialized Port area. No new facilities are required as part of the PDTC proposed project and no new light sources are proposed as part of the project. There would be no change from the current light sources onsite or at other locations in the Port relative to the proposed project. The proposed project would not create any adverse impacts on light and glare in the Port or adjacent areas.

### **1.3 MITIGATION MEASURES**

Since no significant aesthetic impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

---

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:			
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **2.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

Project-related impacts on agricultural resources will be considered significant if any of the following conditions are met:

The proposed project conflicts with existing zoning or agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.

The proposed project will convert prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the farmland mapping and monitoring program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

The proposed project would involve changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

## 2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

2. a) b) & c) The proposed project will occur within the boundaries of the existing PDTC facility. The proposed project would be consistent with the heavy industrial nature of the Port and there are no agricultural resources or operations or Williamson contract areas on or near the PDTC site.

Based upon the above considerations, no significant adverse agricultural resources impacts are expected from the PDTC proposed project.

## 2.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Since no significant agricultural resources impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3. AIR QUALITY.</b> Would the project:			
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Diminish an existing air quality rule or future compliance requirement resulting in a significant increase in air pollutant(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



### 3.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts will be evaluated and compared to the significance criteria in Table 3. If impacts equal or exceed any of those criteria, they will be considered significant.

**TABLE 3**  
**SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds**

Mass Daily Thresholds <sup>a</sup>		
Pollutant	Construction <sup>b</sup>	Operation <sup>c</sup>
NOx	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
VOC	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
PM10	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
PM2.5	55 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
SOx	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
CO	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day
Lead	3 lbs/day	3 lbs/day
Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) and Odor Thresholds		
TACs (including carcinogens and non-carcinogens)	Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk ≥ 10 in 1 million Hazard Index ≥ 1.0 (project increment)	
Odor	Project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402	
Ambient Air Quality for Criteria Pollutants <sup>d</sup>		
NO2  1-hour average annual average	SCAQMD is in attainment; project is significant if it causes or contributes to an exceedance of the following attainment standards: 0.25 ppm (state) 0.053 ppm (federal)	
PM10 24-hour average annual geometric average annual arithmetic mean	10.4 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (construction) <sup>e</sup> & 2.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (operation) 1.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup> 20 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
PM2.5 24-hour average	10.4 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (construction) <sup>e</sup> & 2.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (operation)	
Sulfate 24-hour average	25 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
CO  1-hour average 8-hour average	SCAQMD is in attainment; project is significant if it causes or contributes to an exceedance of the following attainment standards: 20 ppm (state) 9.0 ppm (state/federal)	

<sup>a</sup> Source: SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (SCAQMD, 1993)

<sup>b</sup> Construction thresholds apply to both the South Coast Air Basin and Coachella Valley (Salton Sea and Mojave Desert Air Basins).

<sup>c</sup> For Coachella Valley, the mass daily thresholds for operation are the same as the construction thresholds.

<sup>d</sup> Ambient air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants based on SCAQMD Rule 1303, Table A-2 unless otherwise stated.

<sup>e</sup> Ambient air quality threshold based on SCAQMD Rule 403.

KEY: lbs/day = pounds per day      ppm = parts per million       $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  = microgram per cubic meter       $\geq$  greater than or equal to

### 3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**3. a) & f)** The 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) demonstrates that it may be difficult to achieve applicable ambient air quality standards within the timeframes required under federal law. Growth projections from local general plans and master plans adopted by local governments in the district are some of the inputs used to develop the AQMP. As discussed in the Population and Housing and Transportation/Traffic sections, the proposed project will not require additional employees onsite or generate substantial additional traffic during operation. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause increases in the growth projections in the Port Master Plan. Additionally, this project must comply with applicable SCAQMD rules, regulations, and applicable conditions. By complying with these regulations, the project will be consistent with the goals and objectives of the AQMP.

**3. b), c), and d) Construction Emissions:** Because the proposed project will alter permit conditions on existing equipment, no construction activities are expected; therefore, no construction emissions are expected. Thus, no air quality impacts are expected from construction.

**Operational Emissions:** The proposed modifications to the permit conditions for increasing annual throughput and changing the types of vessels that would be allowed to call at the terminal can result in both operational emissions increases and decreases, which are evaluated below.

The PDTC terminal is currently limited to a maximum throughput of 11 million barrels per year by an SCAQMD permit condition. However, the SCAQMD approved a permit for a new storage tank (Storage Tank 10) at the PDTC facility in August 2003, which limits its throughput to 300,000 barrels per month or 3.6 million barrels per year. PDTC is proposing to increase the overall annual product throughput of the terminal by adding the permit limit for Storage Tank 10 (3.6 million barrels per year) into the current throughput limit (11 million barrels per year) for a total annual throughput limit of 14.6 million barrels per year. This proposed change will allow PDTC to move more product via pipeline only; no change to the throughput for this storage tank has been requested by PDTC operators.

Changing the PDTC Terminal's annual throughput condition to add the existing throughput condition of 3.6 million barrels per year from Storage Tank 10 will not result in an increase in trucks or marine vessels or an increase in related emissions. Instead, the proposed change to add the existing throughput of Storage Tank 10 to the existing throughput of the facility will only result in an increase in the amount of product distributed by pipeline; therefore, no increase in emissions is expected from modifications to this permit condition. Further, no increase in emissions is expected from any of the other existing on-site storage tanks at PDTC, since no additional increase in throughput for other storage tanks has been requested by PDTC operators.

The PDTC facility also currently has a separate throughput limitation on the SCAQMD permit for its truck loading rack which allows a maximum of 29,761 barrels per day (about 11 million barrels per year). PDTC is not requesting to increase the throughput of the truck racks and the proposed project would not change the yearly throughput of the truck loading rack of 11 million barrels per year. Instead, PDTC is requesting that the limit for the truck loading rack be stated as

an average monthly (30-day) limit, rather than a maximum daily limit. The proposal to change the throughput limit from a maximum daily rate to an average monthly rate will have no effect on the amount of product that would be moved on an annual basis because the annual throughput of the truck loading rack would remain at about 11 million barrels per year.

A throughput of 29,761 barrels per day averaged over 30 days equates to approximately 893,000 barrels per month. This proposed permit change from a daily limit to a 30-day average would allow PDTC operators to handle peak demand periods, e.g., the week prior to a holiday, which has the potential to generate additional truck traffic on a peak day. The truck loading rack at the PDTC facility currently handles about 160 to 170 trucks per day. PDTC estimates that the proposed project would allow approximately 30 additional trucks on a peak day. (This estimate is based on the fact that the vapor control system for the offloading rack has a limit of 36,000 barrels per day.) The emission summary for the additional truck trips on a peak day is included in Table 4 and the calculations are included in Appendix A. As shown in Table 4, increased daily truck emissions are below the SCAQMD thresholds for all pollutants. The proposed project would not result in an increase in air emissions on a monthly basis because the proposed project would not result in an increase in throughput (trucks) on a monthly basis. Therefore, if the PDTC loaded an additional 30 trucks on one day, it would have to reduce the number of trucks handled on other days during the month

**TABLE 4**  
**Estimated Increase in Truck Emissions<sup>(1)</sup>**  
**(pounds per day)**

<b>Trucks</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>VOC</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>SO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub><sup>(2)</sup></b>
Increase in Emissions <sup>(3)</sup>	9	2	46	<0.1	2.4	2.3	7,453
SCAQMD Thresholds	550	55	55	150	150	55	--
<b>Significant?</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>--</b>

(1) For more details on the emission calculations and assumptions see Appendix A.

(2) Significance thresholds for CO<sub>2</sub> or other greenhouse gas emissions have not yet been developed. See page 2-11 for a discussion of the project impacts on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

(3) Based on 30 additional truck trips per day.

Finally, PDTC is requesting that the limitation of 24 ship visits per year be modified to include barges. When the facility was originally permitted, it was believed that only large ships carrying 167,500 barrels each (for a total annual throughput of 4,020,000 barrels) would visit the terminal. As a result, 24 ship visits per year was imposed as a permit condition, which is considered to be the environmental baseline for the PDTC terminal. (Note that ships larger than 167,500 barrels capacity or “super tanker ships” would not fit at the berth because the water depth and the length of the dock are not sufficient to handle larger ships.)

In practice, few large ships actually visit the terminal and instead, more smaller barges visit the terminal. PDTC requires much more than 24 barge visits to reach its annual throughput of 4.02 million barrels. Therefore, PDTC operators are requesting to modify the permit so that it can receive 24 ship visits or ship equivalents per year. In order to determine the number of barges

that it would take to generate emissions equivalent to one ship visit, emission calculations were completed for both ships and barges (see Table 5 and Appendix A). The ship emissions include emissions from the main propulsion system and auxiliary engines, cruising, maneuvering, and hotelling. As shown in Table 5, 14 barge visits produce about the same carbon monoxide (CO) and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions, and 15 barge visits produce about the same volatile organic compounds (VOCs), as one ship visit (25,000 to 50,000 dead weight ton (DWT)). About 30 barge visits produce the same particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) emissions as one ship visit. Finally, about 10 barge visits produce the same sulfur oxide (SO<sub>x</sub>) emissions as one ship visit. Therefore, 10 barge visits are considered to be equivalent to one ship visit relative to SO<sub>x</sub> emissions. In fact, 10 barge visits would produce less CO, VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> than one ship visit (see Table 5).

Ships and barges are assumed to arrive and depart in the same manner (i.e., enter California coastal waters 66 miles off shore), cruise, and comply with vessel speed reduction requirements. Ships are expected to cruise for 8.5 hours while barges will cruise for 12 hours, maneuvering in the Port is expected to take 1.6 hours for both vessel types, and hotelling varies depending on the amount of material to be unloaded. (Note: the difference in speed between ships and barges is based on the observed speeds and distances for various types of vessels by the Port of Los Angeles, 2005.) Hotelling is when the vessel is at berth and cargo is loaded or unloaded. It is assumed that the main engines are not on and auxiliary engines are used to provide power to necessary systems including navigation systems, lights, and cooling aboard the vessel while docked. Hotelling emission calculations are based on the largest vessel capacity for each type of vessel. The PDTC berth can only accommodate one vessel (ship or barge) at a time. See Appendix A for more detailed information on the emission calculation methodology.

**TABLE 5**  
**Comparison of Ship versus Barge Emissions\***  
**(pounds per visit)**

<b>Vessel</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>VOC</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>	<b>SO<sub>x</sub></b>
1 Ship Total Emissions	27,814	2,205	1,028	2,879	2,307	15,530
1 Barge Total Emissions	1,886	149	67	94	76	1,504
Barge Equivalence	14	14	15	30	30	10
Emissions for 10 Barges	18,860	1,490	670	940	760	15,040
Difference between Emissions from 1 Ship and emissions from 10 Barges	-8,954	-715	-358	-1,939	-1,547	-490
Truck emissions**	46	9	2	2.4	2.3	<0.1
Total Emissions	-8,908	-706	-356	-1,937	-1,545	-490
SCAQMD Thresholds	550	55	55	150	55	150
<b>Significant?</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>

\* For more details on the emission calculations and assumptions, including the emissions associated with cruising, maneuvering, and hotelling emissions, see Appendix A.

\*\* See Table 4 and Appendix A.

Based on the emission calculations, the proposal to allow 10 barges to replace one ship would result in an overall emissions decrease as barges generate much less emissions than ships. Therefore, no increase in ship emissions is expected and no significant adverse impacts are expected.

Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions from the PDTC terminal are not expected to significantly change due to the proposed project. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from trucks could increase on a peak day (see Table 4), however, they are not expected to increase on a monthly or annual basis since no increase in the number of trucks that visit the terminal on a monthly or annual basis would occur. Sufficient data are not available to calculate the CO<sub>2</sub> emission changes from vessels associated with the proposed project. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is currently developing CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors for marine engines. However, those emission factors are not available at this time. When comparing ship emissions to barge emissions, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for barges are expected to follow the same emission reduction trend as for the other criteria pollutants listed in Table 5, i.e., CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are expected to be much higher for ships than for barges because ship engines are much larger than barge engines. By substituting 10 barges for one ship, the emission calculations show a reduction in emissions of all criteria pollutants (see Table 5). Therefore, a proportionate reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is also expected to result from implementing the proposed project. Therefore, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the proposed project are not considered to be cumulatively considerable as no long-term increase in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is expected.

Similar to the anticipated reduction in criteria pollutants resulting from substituting barges for ships, the proposed project is also expected to result in a decrease in toxic air contaminants. Diesel particulate matter from the combustion of marine fuel is the main toxic air contaminant of concern associated with marine engines. As shown in Tables 2 and 5, the proposed project is expected to result in an overall decrease in PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions, which would lead to a related reduction in diesel particulate matter and related beneficial health impacts associated with reduced exposure to toxic air contaminants (diesel particulate matter). Therefore, no significant adverse health impacts related to exposure to toxic air contaminants are expected due to the proposed project.

**3. e) Odors:** The proposed project is expected to provide an overall decrease in emissions from the marine terminal, specifically related to ship emissions, thus reducing the potential for odors from these sources. No increase in odors is expected from the proposed project.

### 3.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Since no significant air quality impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflicting with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 4.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts on biological resources will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

The project results in a loss of plant communities or animal habitat considered to be rare, threatened or endangered by federal, state or local agencies.

The project interferes substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species.

The project adversely affects aquatic communities through construction or operation of the project.

### 4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**4. a) b) c) d) e) & f)** No construction activities are expected as a result of the PDTC proposed project. The project modifications will occur within the confines of the existing terminal. The existing PDTC site is thoroughly developed and paved, or covered by gravel, and contains buildings and storage tanks. The area surrounding the site consists of other similar port industrial uses. There is no landscaping, natural habitats or unique, rare or endangered plants or animals within the project boundary. Therefore, no change in the diversity or number of terrestrial or marine species, including special status species would occur. The project area is not within a designated wildlife corridor nor has it been designated in any local, state, or federal habitat conservation plan or preservation ordinance.

Surveys of the Long Beach and Los Angeles Harbors showed that gulls are the most abundant birds, but brown pelicans and shorebirds are also common. The endangered California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*) is common in the harbor area and has a nesting area in Los Angeles Harbor, but it is not known to use the project area for foraging or resting, nor is the project area designated critical habitat for the species. The threatened peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*) and endangered California brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*) regularly use the harbor area, perching on structures, however, they do not nest or forage in the project area. No foraging is known or expected to occur in the proposed project area, although several special status species could fly over the project site.

Ships calling at the Port have the potential to introduce invasive species in their ballast water. However, the proposed project would not increase the potential for the introduction of new species into the Port since barges do not use water for ballast. Therefore, the use of barges would not introduce invasive species in ballast water.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, nor would it interfere with the movement of any wildlife species.

Based upon the above considerations, significant adverse biological resources impacts are not expected from the proposed project.

### **4.3 MITIGATION MEASURES**

Since no significant biological resources impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

---

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:			
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside a formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **5.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

Impacts to cultural resources will be considered significant if:

The project results in the disturbance of a significant prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social group.

Unique paleontological resources are present that could be disturbed by construction of the proposed project.

The project would disturb human remains.



**5.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS**

**5. a) b) c) & d)** No construction or demolition activities are required as part of the proposed project so no additional land would be disturbed as a result of site preparation or removal of structures. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically or aesthetically affect a prehistoric or historic building, structure or object. The PDTC project site is located entirely on disturbed land consisting of fill material deposited in the past 75 years. Accordingly, the proposed project has no potential for disturbance or destruction of archaeological or paleontological resources or human remains.

Based upon the above considerations, no significant adverse impacts on cultural resources are expected.

**5.3 MITIGATION MEASURES**

Since no significant cultural resources impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

---

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>6. ENERGY.</b> Would the project:			
a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the need for new or substantially altered power or natural gas utility systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Create any significant effects on local or regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional energy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create any significant effects on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with existing energy standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**6.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

The impacts to energy resources will be considered significant if any of the following criteria are met:

The proposed project conflicts with adopted energy conservation plans or standards.

The proposed project results in substantial depletion of existing energy resource supplies.

An increase in demand for utilities impacts the current capacities of the electric and natural gas utilities.

The proposed project uses non-renewable resources in a wasteful and/or inefficient manner.

## 6.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**6. a) & e)** The proposed project is not subject to any existing energy conservation plans or standards, so it is not expected to conflict with energy plans or standards.

**6. b), c) & d)** The proposed project will not require the construction or operation of any new structures or equipment. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to require any increase in electricity or natural gas use.

Fuel use is expected to be reduced because ship main engines are over 29 times larger than barge engines. Assuming an equivalent fuel use rate for both ship and barges for both the main and auxiliary engines, the proposed project would allow for up to a 70 percent reduction in heavy fuel oil use in main engines and 85 percent reduction in diesel fuel use in auxiliary engines (see Appendix A, page A-7 for detailed calculations). Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to require any increase in marine fuels.

Based upon the above considerations, the energy impacts of the proposed project are expected to be less than significant.

## 6.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Since no significant cultural resources impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:			
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
• Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off- site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## 7.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The impacts on the geological environment will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

Topographic alterations would result in significant changes, disruptions, displacement, excavation, compaction or over covering of large amounts of soil.

Unique geological resources (paleontological resources or unique outcrops) are present that could be disturbed by the construction of the proposed project.

Exposure of people or structures to major geologic hazards such as earthquake surface rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction or landslides.

Secondary seismic effects could occur which could damage facility structures, e.g., liquefaction.

Other geological hazards exist which could adversely affect the facility, e.g., landslides, mudslides.

## 7.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**7. a)** The Port of Long Beach is located in a seismically active region. Seismic records have been available for the last 200 years, with improved instrumental seismic records available for the past 50 years. Based on review of earthquake data, most of the earthquake epicenters occur along the San Andreas, San Jacinto, Whittier-Elsinore and Newport-Inglewood faults (Jones and Hauksson, 1986). All these faults are elements of the San Andreas fault system. Past experience indicates that there has not been any substantial damage, structural or otherwise to the PDTC as a result of earthquakes. However, faults in the area are potential sources of strong ground shaking, including the following: 1) the San Andreas fault; 2) the Newport-Inglewood fault; 3) the Malibu-Santa Monica-Raymond Hills fault; 4) the Palos Verdes fault; 5) the Whittier-Elsinore fault; 6) the Sierra Madre fault; 7) the San Fernando fault; 8) the Elysian Park fault; and 9) the Torrance-Wilmington fault.

In addition to the known surface faults, shallow-dipping concealed “blind” thrust faults have been postulated to underlie portions of the Los Angeles Basin. Because there exist few data to define the potential extent of rupture planes associated with these concealed thrust faults, the maximum earthquake that they might generate is largely unknown.

The closest fault zones to the PDTC site include the Newport-Inglewood Fault approximately three miles north-northeast of the site, the Palos Verdes Hills fault located about 2.5 miles west of the site, the Whittier Fault about 19 miles northeast of the site, and the San Andreas Fault approximately 50 miles northeast of the site.

The proposed project would not require the construction of any new equipment or structures; therefore, the proposed project will not introduce any new geologic hazards to the area or increase the risk to life or property associated with ground shaking, a seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides. Therefore, no significant impacts from earthquake-related hazards are expected.

**7. b, c, d, and e)** The proposed project will require no additional construction activities and will not require construction of any new structures. The site is currently flat and no unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures are expected to result from the proposed project. The marine terminal is not prone to landslides nor does it have any unique geologic features since it is located in a heavy industrial area. The PDTC facility does not use septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Further, no increase in water use or wastewater generated is expected due to the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project will not adversely affect soils associated with a septic system or alternative wastewater disposal system.

Based upon the above considerations, significant geology and soils impacts are not expected from the PDTC proposed project.

## 7.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Since no significant geology and soils impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Significantly increased fire hazard in areas with flammable materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## 8.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The impacts associated with hazards will be considered significant if any of the following occur:

Non-compliance with any applicable design code or regulation.

Non-conformance to National Fire Protection Association standards.

Non-conformance to regulations or generally accepted industry practices related to operating policy and procedures concerning the design, construction, security, leak detection, spill containment or fire protection.

Exposure to hazardous chemicals in concentrations equal to or greater than the Emergency Response Planning Guideline (ERPG-2) levels.

## 8.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**8. a) & b)** PDTC receives and distributes petroleum products via vessel, truck and pipeline. The PDTC proposed project will occur within the confines of the existing marine terminal and does not require the construction of any new structures. The proposed project would also not change the types of materials handled at the terminal or increase the potential for exposure to hazards to the general public.

The proposed project would result in an increase in throughput at the terminal from 11 million barrels per year to 14.6 million barrels per year. The increased throughput would result in more material transferred by pipeline, as the facility is not increasing the number of vessels that visit the facility. PDTC would continue to use existing pipelines to transport petroleum products so there would be no change in exposure to the public to hazards from pipelines.

### Truck Hazards

The proposed project would result in a permit modification to allow for an average monthly permit limit on the loading rack throughput (893,000 barrels per month), rather than a maximum daily limit (29,761 barrels per day). The proposed revisions to the permit condition may result in the increase of about 30 trucks on a maximum daily basis. However, there would be no change in the number of trucks that visit the facility on a monthly or annual basis. If the facility has a high number of trucks on a few days during the month, it would have a decreased number of trucks on other days in order to not exceed the throughput limit of 893,000 barrels per month.

Therefore, there would be no change in the probability of an accident or hazard due to the proposed project on a monthly or annual basis.

### Ship/Barge Hazards

The Port of Long Beach risk management program identifies “vulnerable resources” as significant populations or facilities that are susceptible to injury or damage from accidents involving hazardous materials. Accident potential and related risk to public health and safety concern the populations within and beyond the project area boundaries. Significant populations include permanent residents, visitors, and employees.

Residential populations are generally the largest and most vulnerable group susceptible to injury or damage from accidents. In this case, there are no residential land uses in proximity to the PDTC terminal. The residential population nearest the project site is located across the Los Angeles River Channel and Queensway Bay, in the core downtown area of the city of Long Beach. This distance and physical separation between land uses lowers the risk to residential populations from Port activities to less than significant.

Employees are potentially exposed to a higher level of risk than other populations. This group may be directly involved in the handling, storage, and transport of hazardous materials. However, worker training is extensive and includes emergency response and evacuation procedures. The level of risk to employees is less than significant, given appropriate worker training.

The proposed project would also result in a permit modification to allow for additional smaller barges to visit the terminal instead of only larger ship. The proposed revisions to the permit condition would allow for an increase in the number of vessels that visit the terminal on an annual average (ten barges are equivalent to one ship carrying 180,000 barrels of product). However, the total annual volume of petroleum product that arrives by either ship or barge is not expected to change. Therefore, the hazards associated with vessel transport of petroleum products are expected to remain the same or be less due to the decrease in the amount of petroleum product delivered per visit. The hazards (spills, fires, explosions, etc.) associated with the delivery of smaller volumes of petroleum product are less than the hazards associated with the delivery of larger volumes of petroleum products.

The probability of a release is expected to be greater than current conditions as more barges would visit the terminal than ships; however, the probability of a release is expected to remain remote as there has been no release from a ship or barge during the operation of the PDTC facility. In 2006, about 6,087 vessels called at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (LA/LB, 2006). There were three reported vessel accidents (including vessel collisions between two moving vessels, vessel collisions between moving vessels and stationary objects, and vessel groundings) in the Ports of Los Angeles/Long Beach during 2006 for a reported accident rate of 0.00016, indicating that reportable accidents are rare. None of the accidents resulted in a spill to a waterway (LA/LB, 2006). Therefore, the hazards associated with marine vessel transport of petroleum products are expected to be less than significant.

**8. c)** The PDTC terminal is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, no potential for impacts from hazardous emissions or the handling of acutely hazardous materials, substances and wastes that could affect schools are expected.

**8. d)** The PDTC terminal is not located on a list of sites compiled pursuant to §65962.5 of the Government Code. Accordingly, significant adverse hazards and hazardous materials impacts are not expected from the proposed project.

**8. e) & f)** The PDTC is not located within two miles of an airport (either public or private), and is not located within an airport land use plan.

**8. g)** The proposed project is not expected to interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The PDTC terminal has an emergency response plan in effect. However, no modifications to the emergency response plan or the emergency evacuation plan are expected to be required as a result of the proposed project because no new facilities are proposed as part of the project. In addition, barges are much smaller in size and easier to maneuver than ships. In the event of an emergency, barges would be able to leave the berth and port faster than a ship allowing for quicker evacuation than ships.

**8. h) & i)** The proposed project will not increase the existing risk of fire hazards in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees. No substantial or native vegetation exists on or near the PDTC terminal so the proposed project is not expected to expose people or structures to wildland fires. Therefore, no significant increase in wildland fire hazards is expected at the PDTC terminal.

Based on the above considerations, the potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts related to the proposed permit modifications at the PDTC terminal, and the transport of hazardous materials are less than significant.

### 8.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Since no significant adverse hazard/hazardous materials impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:			
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
table level (e.g. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| k) | Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| l) | Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| m) | Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| n) | Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| o) | Require in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

## **9.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

Potential impacts on water resources will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

### **Water Quality:**

The project will cause degradation or depletion of ground water resources substantially affecting current or future uses.

The project will cause the degradation of surface water substantially affecting current or future uses.

The project will result in a violation of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements.

The capacities of existing or proposed wastewater treatment facilities and the sanitary sewer system are not sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

The project results in substantial increases in the area of impervious surfaces, such that interference with groundwater recharge efforts occurs.

The project results in alterations to the course or flow of floodwaters.

**Water Demand:**

The existing water supply does not have the capacity to meet the increased demands of the project, or the project would use a substantial amount of potable water.

The project increases demand for water by more than five million gallons per day.

## **9.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS**

**9. a), f), k), l) & o)** No increase in water use or wastewater generation is expected due to the proposed project. The proposed project does not require any construction activities and no new facilities are required at the PDTC terminal. Therefore, no increase in water use or wastewater generation will occur as part of the proposed project. Further, no increase in the use of ballast water is expected since barges do not use water for ballast.

**9. b)** The proposed project is not expected to significantly adversely affect the quantity or quality of groundwater in the area of the terminal. There is no beneficial use of ground water in the area since most of the aquifers are unusable for fresh water supply because of salt-water intrusion. No water is required for construction and the proposed project does not require any increase in water use. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are expected to ground water quality from the PDTC proposed project.

**9. c), d), e) & m)** The proposed project will not result in an increase in storm water runoff as no construction activities and no new structures are required. The site is already graded and flat and no new paved surfaces will be required. PDTC already has implemented a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) for the terminal in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Industrial Storm Water Permit. No changes to the SWPP will be required as part of the proposed project. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts on storm water runoff are expected.

**9. g), h), & i)** The proposed project will not require construction activities and does not include the construction of any new housing nor would it place new housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. The PDTC facility is not located within a 100-year flood zone and would not expose people or property to any known water-related flood hazards. No significant adverse impacts associated with flood hazards are expected due to the proposed project.

**9. j)** The PDTC facility is located within the Port of Long Beach. The past construction of the existing breakwaters has minimized the potential impacts of a tsunami or seiche to the terminal. The proposed project will not require construction activities or any new structures so that no significant new impacts are expected. Further, the PDTC facility is located in a relatively flat area, therefore, the proposed project is not susceptible to mudflows (e.g., hillside or slope areas) so that no significant impacts from mudflows would be expected.

**9. n)** No increase in water use will occur due to the proposed project. The proposed project does not require any construction activities and no new facilities are required at the PDTC facility. Therefore, no increase in water use will occur as part of the proposed project. No significant adverse impact on water use is expected due to the proposed project.

Based on the above considerations, the potential hydrology and water quality impacts, especially those associated with wastewater discharge, storm water discharge, and water demand are expected to be less than significant for the proposed project.

### 9.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Since no significant hydrology and water quality impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:			
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 10.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Land use and planning impacts will be considered significant if the project conflicts with the land use and zoning designations established by the Port of Long Beach.

### 10.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**10. a)** The proposed project will occur at the existing PDTC facility, thus, it will not result in physically dividing any established communities, but will continue the use of the site as a marine terminal.

**10. b) & c)** The proposed project conforms to the overall goals of the Port Master Plan, local zoning ordinances, and relevant regional plans. The site is in the Port's District 2 Northeast Harbor Planning District. The facility is zoned as a primary port facility, which is one of the identified uses in District 2 (PLB, 2003). The existing terminal and the proposed project are consistent with this land use. The proposed project would not change the use of the facility and is consistent with the Port Master Plan. Further, there are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans located within or adjacent to the existing facility.

Based upon the above considerations, significant adverse land use planning impacts are not expected from the implementation of the proposed project.

### **10.3 MITIGATION MEASURES**

Since no significant land use and planning impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

---

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **11.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

Project-related impacts on mineral resources will be considered significant if any of the following conditions are met:

The project would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

The proposed project results in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

## 11.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**11. a) & b)** The proposed project will occur within the confines of the existing marine terminal and would be consistent with the heavy industrial zoning for the Terminal. No mineral resources or operations occur at or near the PDTC facility. There are no provisions of the proposed project that would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state such as aggregate, coal, clay, shale, et cetera, or of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

Based on the above considerations, no adverse impacts on mineral resources are expected due to implementation of the proposed project.

## 11.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Since no significant mineral resources impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>12. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:			
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airship, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## **12.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

Impacts on noise will be considered significant if:

Construction noise levels exceed the City of Long Beach noise ordinance or, if the noise threshold is currently exceeded, project noise sources increase ambient noise levels by more than three decibels (dBA) at the site boundary. Construction noise levels will be considered significant if they exceed federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) noise standards for workers.

The proposed project operational noise levels exceed any of the local noise ordinances at the site boundary or, if the noise threshold is currently exceeded, project noise sources increase ambient noise levels by more than three dBA at the site boundary.

## **12.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS**

**12. a), b), c), & d)** The PDTC site is located in an active industrial area with ambient noise levels typical of industrial areas. In addition, the site is adjacent to facilities with routine truck and rail traffic into and out of the industrial facilities, and surrounded by the routes used by many of those trucks. The nearest residences are over a mile to the east of the PDTC facility, separated from the site by a variety of heavy industrial facilities (including other port facilities and refineries), freeways, and the Los Angeles River. There are no sensitive receptors such as schools, or hospitals within one mile of the project site.

No construction activities are required so no noise impacts will be generated by construction activities.

The proposed project will not require the operation of new stationary sources so no noise will be generated by on-site equipment. The proposed project will change the limit on the truck rack from a maximum daily limit of 29,761 barrels per day to a 30-day average limit based on 29,761 barrels per day. This will allow PDTC to better distribute product during peak demand periods, e.g., prior to holidays. Therefore, on a peak day, truck traffic to the facility could increase by a maximum of about 30 trucks. The facility operates 24 hours per day and the trucks are expected to visit the facility throughout the day, generating an increase of one to three trucks per hour. The contribution of PDTC to the local traffic noise in the port area is negligible since the existing

traffic noise on the local streets and freeways is orders of magnitude greater than the one to three trucks per hour that would be generated by PDTC proposed project.

The proposed project would allow up to 240 additional smaller barges to visit the terminal (assuming no ships visit the terminal), instead of the 24 larger ships that carry up to 180,000 barrels. The larger ships tend to have larger engines that generate higher noise levels than the smaller barges. Only one vessel (ship or barge) can fit at the terminal at a time. Therefore, the proposed changes are not expected to generate greater noise impacts from vessels than the current facility operations.

**12. e) & f)** The PDTC is not located within an airport land use plan, and the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with airplanes.

Based upon the above considerations, significant noise impacts are not expected from the proposed project.

### **12.3 MITIGATION MEASURES**

The proposed project will not cause an overall significant adverse impact on noise. Since no significant noise impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

---

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:			
a) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **13.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

The impacts of the proposed project on population and housing will be considered significant if the following criteria are exceeded:



The demand for temporary or permanent housing exceeds the existing supply.

The proposed project produces additional population, housing or employment inconsistent with adopted plans either in terms of overall amount or location.

### **13.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS**

**13. a), b) & c)** The proposed project will not require any additional workers at the facility. No construction activities are required and no increase in the permanent number of workers at the terminal is required. The proposed project is not expected to result in the creation of any industry that would affect population growth, directly or indirectly induce the construction of single- or multiple-family units, or require the displacement of people or housing elsewhere in the District. Therefore, no impacts on population growth, either directly or indirectly, are expected.

Based upon these considerations, significant population and housing impacts are not expected from the implementation of the proposed project.

### **13.3 MITIGATION MEASURES**

Since no significant population and housing impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

---

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>14. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the proposal result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:			
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## 14.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Impacts on public services will be considered significant if the project results in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response time or other performance objectives.

## 14.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**14. a) & b)** The PDTC facility receives police and fire protection services from the City of Long Beach. The facility is surrounded by fences and entry is restricted through entry and exit gates. The facility operates on a 24-hour basis so workers are always at the site. A 24-hour security force operates at the facility. The proposed project would not increase the capacity of the facility or change the level of operations. The proposed project is not expected to increase the need or demand for additional public services (e.g., fire departments and police departments) above current levels.

**14. c), d) & e)** The proposed project will not require any additional workers at the facility. No construction activities are required and no increase in the number of permanent workers at the terminal is required. Thus, no adverse impacts are expected to local schools, parks, other public facilities or government services.

Based upon these considerations, significant public services impacts are not expected from the implementation of the proposed PDTC project.

## 14.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Since no significant public services impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>15. RECREATION.</b>			
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 15.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The impacts to recreation will be considered significant if:

The project results in an increased demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.

The project adversely effects existing recreational opportunities.

### 15.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**15. a) & b)** The proposed project will not require any additional workers at the facility. No construction activities are required and no increase in the number of permanent workers at the terminal is required. Thus, no impacts are expected to recreational facilities and the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

### 15.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The proposed project will not cause an overall significant adverse impact on recreation. Since no significant recreation impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>16. SOLID/HAZARDOUS WASTE.</b> Would the project:			
a) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid and hazardous waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## 16.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The proposed project impacts on solid and hazardous waste will be considered significant if the following occur:

The generation and disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous waste exceeds the capacity of designated landfills.

## 16.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**16. a)** No construction activities are associated with the proposed project so no waste will be generated from construction or demolition activities. The proposed project would not generate any additional solid or hazardous waste. Therefore, no impacts on landfills are expected from the proposed project.

**16. b)** The proposed project is not expected to adversely affect the PDTC's ability to comply with federal, state, and local solid/hazardous waste regulations, so no impacts on compliance is expected.

The proposed project will have no significant adverse impacts on solid/hazardous waste.

## 16.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Since no significant solid/hazardous waste impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:			
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 17.1 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The impacts on transportation/traffic will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

Peak period levels on major arterials are disrupted to a point where level of service (LOS) is reduced to D, E or F for more than one month.

An intersection's volume to capacity ratio increase by 0.02 (two percent) or more when the LOS is already D, E or F.

A major roadway is closed to all through traffic, and no alternate route is available.

There is an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

The demand for parking facilities is substantially increased.

Water borne, rail car or air traffic is substantially altered.

Traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians are substantially increased.

## 17.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

**17. a) & b)** No construction activities will occur as part of the proposed project so no construction-related traffic impacts will occur.

The work force at the PDTC will not increase as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project may result in an increase in the maximum number of trucks that can visit the site by about 30 trucks per day. The facility operates 24 hours per day and the trucks are expected to visit the facility throughout the day, generating an increase of one to three trucks per hour. The contribution of PDTC to the local traffic in the port area is negligible since the additional traffic generated is only one to three trucks per hour. Therefore, no significant adverse traffic impacts are expected during the operational phase.

**17. c)** The PDTC facility does not require the transport of materials to or from the facility via air traffic. Thus, the proposed project will not change to existing air traffic patterns.

**17. d) & e)** The siting of the PDTC facility is consistent with surrounding industrial and port-related land uses and traffic/circulation in the surrounding area has been designed to accommodate related truck traffic patterns. Thus, the proposed project is not expected to substantially increase traffic hazards or create incompatible uses at or adjacent to the PDTC facility. The proposed project is not expected to alter the existing long-term circulation patterns. Emergency access at the facility will not be impacted by the proposed project because only one barge or ship at a time can dock at the PDTC terminal. Further, PDTC will continue to maintain their existing emergency access and the emergency response plan will not need to be modified.

**17. f)** No significant adverse impacts on parking are expected due to implementation of the proposed project. No construction activities are expected and no increase in permanent workers are required at the PDTC facility due to the proposed project. No additional parking will be needed because no increase in the PDTC work force is required. Therefore, no significant adverse impact on parking is expected as a result of the proposed project.

**17. g)** The proposed project will occur within the confines of the existing facility and the increase in truck traffic will be minimal, about one to three trucks per hour. The increase in truck traffic is not expected to conflict with policies supporting alternative transportation since the proposed project does not involve or affect alternative transportation modes (e.g. bicycles or buses).

Based upon these considerations, significant transportation/traffic impacts are not expected from proposed PDTC project.

## 17.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The proposed project will not cause an overall significant adverse impact on transportation/traffic. Since no significant transportation/traffic impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>			
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 18.1 CHECKLIST RESPONSE EVALUATION

**18. a)** As shown in Section 4 – Biological Resources and Section 5 – Cultural Resources of this environmental checklist evaluation, the PDTC proposed project is not expected to reduce or eliminate any plant or animal species or destroy major periods of California history or prehistory. The affected site is part of an existing marine terminal facility, which has been previously graded, such that the proposed project is not expected to extend into environmentally sensitive areas, so that no significant adverse impacts are expected.

**18. b)** No project-specific significant impacts were identified for the proposed PDTC project. As a result, project-specific impacts do not contribute to significant adverse cumulative air quality impacts. Per CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(4), the mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project's incremental effects are cumulatively considerable. Since project-specific impacts are not significant they are not considered to be cumulatively considerable.

**18. c)** The analysis of the PDTC proposed project in this Negative Declaration concluded that hazards and hazardous materials impacts would not be significant since no change in the volumes or type of material transported and stored at the facility will change. Further, air quality impacts for the proposed project were analyzed in this Negative Declaration. No construction air quality impacts are expected and mobile source emissions from additional trucks that may occur on a peak day are substantially less than the applicable criteria and precursor pollutant significance thresholds. No significant adverse traffic impacts have been identified that would result from up to 30 additional truck trips per day.

## **19.0 Conclusion**

Based on the environmental analysis prepared for the currently proposed project, the SCAQMD has quantitatively and qualitatively demonstrated that the proposed project will not generate any significant adverse impacts and meets the qualifications for the preparation of a Negative Declaration per the requirements of CEQA Guidelines §15070.

M:\DBS\2399\Neg Dec\C2399Chap2.doc



### REFERENCES

- Los Angeles, City of 1999. Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan, A Part of the City of Los Angeles, General Plan, July 1999.  
<http://www.lacity.org/PLN/complan/westla/wlmpage.htm>.
- Los Angeles, Port of, 2005. Port of Los Angeles Baseline Air Emissions Inventory – 2001. Port of Los Angeles, July 2005.
- Los Angeles/Long Beach, 2006. Ports of Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor Safety Plan, 2006.
- SCAQMD, 1993. CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD, May 1993.
- SCAQMD, 2003. Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Rule 105.1 – Reduction of PM10 and Ammonia Emissions from Fluid Catalytic Cracking Units.  
<http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/documents/2003>
- SCAQMD, 2003b. 2003 Air Quality Management Plan.  
[http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/documents/2003/aqmd/finalEA/aqmp/AQMP\\_FEIR.html](http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/documents/2003/aqmd/finalEA/aqmp/AQMP_FEIR.html).
- SCAQMD, 2004. 2003 Air Quality Summary.
- CIWMB, 2006. Solid Waste Information System, 2006. [www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS](http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS)

## ACRONYMS

ABBREVIATION	DESCRIPTION
AQMD	Air Quality Management District
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ARB	Air Resources Board
BACT	Best Available Control Technology
Basin	South Coast Air Basin
BBL	Barrel
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CIWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board
CO	Carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
CUP	Conditional Use Permit
dBA	A-weighted noise level measurement in decibels
DOT	Department of Transportation
DTSC	California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
DWT	Dead Weight Ton
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
ERPG	Emergency Response Planning Guideline
°F	Degrees Fahrenheit
IS	Initial Study
°K	degrees Kelvin
lbs	pounds
lbs/hr	pounds per hour
LOS	Level of Service
m/s	meters per second
MMscf	Million Standard Cubic Feet
N <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen
NH <sub>3</sub>	Ammonia
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
nanograms/m <sup>3</sup>	nanograms per cubic meter
NESHAPS	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NIOSH	National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NOx	nitrogen oxide

NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards
NSR	New Source Review
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PDTC	Petro-Diamond Terminal Company
PM10	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
PM2.5	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
Port	Port of Long Beach
ppbv	parts per billion by volume
ppm	parts per million
ppmv	parts per million by volume
ppmw	parts per million by weight
PRC	Public Resources Code
psi	pounds per square inch
psia	pounds per square inch absolute
psig	pounds per square inch (gauge)
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCH	State Clearinghouse
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
SO <sub>x</sub>	sulfur oxide
SPCC	Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TACs	toxic air contaminants
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
U.S. EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USC	United States Code
USGS	United States Geological Society
VOC	volatile organic compounds

## GLOSSARY

TERM	DEFINITION
Ambient Noise	The background sound of an environment in relation to which all additional sounds are heard
Barrel	42 gallons.
dBA	The decibel (dDB) is one tenth of a bel where one bel represents a difference in noise level between two intensities $I_1$ , $I_0$ where one is ten times greater than the other. (A) indicates the measurement is weighted to the human ear.
Hydrocarbon	Organic compound containing hydrogen and carbon, commonly occurring in petroleum, natural gas, and coal.
$L_{50}$	Sound level exceeded 50 percent of the time (average or mean level)
Paleontological	Prehistoric life.
Peak Hour	This typically refers to the hour during the morning (typically 7 AM to 9 AM) or the evening (typically 4 PM to 6 PM) in which the greatest number of vehicles trips are generated by a given land use or are traveling on a given roadway.
Seiches	A vibration of the surface of a lake or landlocked sea that varies in period from a few minutes to several hours and which may change in intensity.